

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION N	10.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,505		10/26/2001	Michael S. Foster	030048025US	8936
25096	7590	09/06/2005		EXAMINER	
PERKIN PATENT	IS COIE I	LLP	HAN, CLEMENCE S		
P.O. BOX 1247			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTL	SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			2665	
				DATE MAILED: 00/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	V					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/039,505	FOSTER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
-	Clemence Han	2665				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed is will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Ju	<u>une 2005</u> .					
' =	action is non-final.					
, =	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☑ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 26 October 2001 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2665

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)1. because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: All 20 figures are objected. The "interconnect fabric module 100" (6th line from the bottom of the page 15) is shown as "00" in Figure 1. Such discrepancies have occurred in each subsequent figures including the "decision block 2005" (page 34 line 7) which is shown as "05" in Figure 20. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2665

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant is advised to update the correct status of the related applications mentioned in page 1-3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1, 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims 1, 12 and 25 recite the limitation of selecting the frame based on the priority score and the length of time that the frame has been stored. The examiner could not find the support for this limitation. The paragraph [0055] in page 24 describes a buffer arbitrator using the priority to select a frame to be transmitted. It also describes a buffer arbitrator using the latency to select a frame to be transmitted. However, it

Art Unit: 2665

does not describe using both criteria in one embodiment to select a frame to be transmitted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. Claim 1-8, 10-20, 22-33 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchem et al. (US 6,608,819).

Regarding to claim 1, Mitchem teaches a method in a switch for buffering data received through a source port before transmitting the data through a destination port, the method comprising: receiving a first frame of data through the source port 16 (Column 6 Line 49); storing the received first frame of data; receiving a second frame of data through the source port (Column 6 Line 49); storing the received second frame of data; selecting either the first frame or the second frame for transmitting through the destination port based on a priority score of the first frame and the second frame (Column 6 Line 55-58) and the length of time that the first frame and the second frame have been stored (Column 9 Line 13-21).

Art Unit: 2665

Regarding to claim 2, Mitchem teaches the first and second frames are stored in a buffer that is used to store frames received only through the source port (Column 7 Line 66).

Regarding to claim 3, Mitchem teaches the priority score of a frame based on a priority associated with the frame (Column 6 Line 59-61).

Regarding to claim 4, Mitchem teaches the priority score of a frame based on a class of service of the frame (Column 7 Line 41-44).

Regarding to claim 5, Mitchem teaches the priority score of a frame based on latency of the frame (Column 9 Line 13-17).

Regarding to claim 6, Mitchem teaches the first frame is stored in a first buffer and the second frame is stored in a second buffer and all frames of a connection are stored in the same buffer (Figure 4A).

Regarding to claim 7, Mitchem teaches the switch is an interconnect fabric Module 12.

Regarding to claim 8, Mitchem teaches the switch is Fibre Channel compatible (Column 6 Line 39).

Regarding to claim 10, Mitchem teaches the second frame is received after the first frame and wherein the second frame is selected (in Figure 4B, frame C was received later than frame B but selected to be transmitted before frame B).

Application/Control Number: 10/039,505

Art Unit: 2665

Regarding to claim 11, Mitchem teaches a later received frame is selected before an earlier received frame (in Figure 4B, frame C was received later than frame B but selected to be transmitted before frame B).

Regarding to claim 12 and 25, Mitchem teaches a routing device comprising: a first buffer for storing a first frame received through a source port 16 (Column 6 Line 49); a second buffer for storing a second frame received through the source port 16 (Column 6 Line 49); and a component that selects either the first frame or the second frame for transmitting through a destination port based on a priority score of the first frame and the second frame (Column 6 Line 55-58) and the length of time that the first frame and the second frame have been stored (Column 9 Line 13-21).

Regarding to claim 13 and 26, Mitchem teaches each source port of the routing device has a first and second buffer and a component that selects (Figure 4A and Column 7 Line 65 – Column 8 Line 1).

Regarding to claim 14 and 27, Mitchem teaches the first and second buffer are used to store frames received only through the source port (Column 7 Line 66).

Regarding to claim 15 and 28, Mitchem teaches the priority score of a frame is based on a priority associated with the frame (Column 6 Line 59-61).

Regarding to claim 16 and 29, Mitchem teaches the priority score of a frame

Art Unit: 2665

is based on a class of service of the frame (Column 7 Line 41-44).

Regarding to claim 17 and 30, Mitchem teaches the priority score of a frame is based on latency of the frame (Column 9 Line 13-17).

Regarding to claim 18 and 31, Mitchem teaches all frames of a connection are stored in the same buffer (Figure 4A).

Regarding to claim 19 and 32, Mitchem teaches the routing device is an interconnect fabric module 12.

Regarding to claim 20 and 33, Mitchem teaches the routing device is Fibre channel compatible (Column 6 Line 39).

Regarding to claim 22 and 35, Mitchem teaches the second frame is received after the first frame and the second frame is selected (in Figure 4B, frame C was received later than frame B but selected to be transmitted before frame B).

Regarding to claim 23 and 36, Mitchem teaches a later received frame is selected before an earlier received frame (in Figure 4B, frame C was received later than frame B but selected to be transmitted before frame B).

Regarding to claim 24 and 37, Mitchem teaches the routing device is a switch 12.

Application/Control Number: 10/039,505

Art Unit: 2665

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Page 8

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claim 9, 21 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchem et al. in view of Hu et al. (US 6,535,518).

Regarding to claim 9, Mitchem teaches a method in a switch for buffering data received through a source port before transmitting the data through a destination port, the method comprising: receiving a first frame of data through the source port 16 (Column 6 Line 49); storing the received first frame of data; receiving a second frame of data through the source port (Column 6 Line 49); storing the received second frame of data; selecting either the first frame or the second frame for transmitting through the destination port based on a priority score of the first frame and the second frame (Column 6 Line 55-58). Mitchem, however, does not teach InfiniBand compatible switch. Hu teaches InfiniBand compatible switch (Column 7 Line 45-55 and Column 8 Line 16). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Mitchem to be InfiniBand compatible as taught by Hu in order to be implemented in various possible network (Column 8 Line 10-13).

Page 9

Regarding to claim 21 and 34, Mitchem teaches a routing device comprising: a first buffer for storing a first frame received through a source port 16 (Column 6 Line 49); a second buffer for storing a second frame received through the source port 16 (Column 6 Line 49); and a component that selects either the first frame or the second frame for transmitting through a destination port based on a priority score of the first frame and the second frame (Column 6 Line 55-58).

Mitchem, however, does not teach InfiniBand compatible routing device. Hu teaches InfiniBand compatible routing device (Column 7 Line 45-55 and Column 8 Line 16). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Mitchem to be InfiniBand compatible as taught by Hu in order to be implemented in various possible network (Column 8 Line 10-13).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on June 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to page 8, the applicant argues that Mitchem does not disclose selecting the frame based on the length of time that the first frame and the second frame have been stored. Mitchem teaches selecting the frame based on the length of time that the first frame and the second frame have been stored (Column 9 Line 13-21). The applicant, further, argues that Mitchem discloses only receiving data

Art Unit: 2665

but not storing a frame of data. Mitchem teaches storing received data until it is transmitted (Column 5 Line 11-13).

Therefore, the examiner contends that Mitchem teaches all limitations of the independent claims.

Conclusion

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clemence Han whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2665

(571) 272-3158. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. H.
Clemence Han
Examiner
Art Unit 2665

STEVEN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER